

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5 – 12, 18, 24, 30, and 31 are in the application, with claims 1, 2, 7, 18, 24, and 30 having been amended, and claims 3 – 4, 13 – 17, 19 – 23, and 25 – 29 having been cancelled. Claims 1, 24, and 30 are the independent claims herein. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 7,197,556 (“Short”). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 24, and 30

Amended independent claim one discloses a method comprising receiving a request from a second network device for a first network device connected to a network to look up location information. The request is contained in a first dynamic host configuration protocol message. The method further comprises determining the location information looked up by the first network device, storing the location information in a second dynamic host configuration protocol message, and sending the location information to the second network device in the second dynamic host configuration protocol message. Moreover, the location information comprises a latitude and a longitude of the second device.

The art of record cannot be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving a request from a second network device for a first network device connected to a network to look up location information where the request is contained in a first dynamic host configuration protocol message, and the location information is stored in a second dynamic host configuration protocol message.

Short discloses a typical network system that employs DHCP as well known in the art. Specifically, at column 5 lines 36 to 42, Short describes a stereotypical DHCP embodiment

where an IP address is assigned to a host that logs into a network. However, Short does not disclose DHCP being used for anything other than typical DHCP usage as described.

Accordingly, nowhere can Short be seen to disclose or to suggest receiving a request from a second network device for a first network device connected to a network to look up location information where the request is contained in a first dynamic host configuration protocol message, and the location information is stored in a second dynamic host configuration protocol message.

In view of the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 and its related dependent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 24 and 30 recite similar limitations. Therefore, amended independent claims 24 and 30 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 2, 24, and 30

Amended dependent claim 2 discloses that the location information comprises a latitude and a longitude of the second device. Nowhere does the art of record disclose or suggest that the location information comprises a latitude and a longitude of the second device.

Short discloses the use of virtual local area network “VLAN” tagging as a means of determining location. For example, a specific room in a hotel or an apartment building can be assigned a tag, or a floor within a building, a wing within a building or the building itself may be assigned an individual tag. A gateway device may use a port-location authorization table to manage the assigned ports. However, Short does not disclose that the port-location authorization table comprises latitudes and longitudes that correspond with the various VLAN tags.

Accordingly, nowhere can Short be seen to disclose or to suggest that the location information comprises a latitude and a longitude of the second device.

In view of the foregoing, dependent claim 2, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Amended independent claims 24 and 30 each recite a similar limitation. Therefore, amended independent claims 24 and 30 are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The outstanding Office Action presents a number of characterizations regarding the applied references, some of which are not directly addressed by this response. Applicants do not necessarily agree with the characterizations and reserve the right to further discuss those characterizations.

For at least the reasons given above, it is submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience. Alternatively, if there remains any question regarding the present application or any of the cited references, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-4982.

Respectfully submitted,

July 11, 2007
Date

/Richard S. Finkelstein/
Richard S. Finkelstein
Registration No. 56,534
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
50 Locust Avenue
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-4982